Mel & Lerah Parker
PO BOX 609
Libby, MT 59923

Nov, 3 2006

Mike Cirian
EPA Libby Office
501 Mineral AV.
Libby, MT 59923

Mike:

We received your letter on Oct. 25,2006 regarding the connex boxes.. Apparently on Feb. 28, 2007 they will be removed by the vendor. We are still trying to resolve the issue of the timing of the NOA and the completion of the Response Actions and you find it necessary to remind us of the connex boxes. Mike any damage to the property due to the removal of the two units will be assessed and charged to the EPA by the landowner.

We also got your letter on Oct. 26, 2006 regarding "Pressure losses in the potable water line at the Screening Plant. Yes, Mike you were able to do a diagnostic test on the water line with the help of a plumber. The purpose of the shut off valve Mike was to determine if water was leaking from the green building to the valve or the faucet to the pressure tank. You tested the line from the valve to the pump! That's good! No leaks ! That's good! So you made the statement that the leaks must be our responsibility. That's good! However, while you were testing your line for leaks and never found any, did it occur to you that by opening the valve to the shop that you would be able to evaluate whether there was a leak in that line? That is why **WE** PUT THAT SHUT OFF VALVE AT THAT LOCATION! With out it neither of us with our without a diagnostic test would have been able to "truly" determine what the problem was.

When **WE** ran a diagnostic appraisal of the problem we were able to determine what the situation was, and how it was corrected.

Two factors were very important:

1.) We took readings on both lines that was of concern to you and also on the one going to the shop.

2.) We shut the pump **OFF** after it reached the 60# shut off level and this would create a static level of pressure that would not allow the pump to re-cycle if it were to reach the 40# - refill point.

Can you honestly say that the pump ***did not*** re-cycle during your "Diagnostic " evaluation? Did you eliminate all possibilities of error by leaving the pump on and waiting for 1/2 hour or 12 hr., or whatever time. Our findings with the pump off were there were no leaks in either section of the line over a 24 hr. period taken for each line that was separated by the shut-off valve.

We now know that when the faucet was dug up on July 29, 2006 it was determined at that time that you folks were responsible for the plugged line to the faucet. We took the bag of filings that were cut from the black 2" Poly pipe connections from the well house to the faucet and took them for you to review.

Your father had an accident and you were preparing to leave on his behalf. Therefore, we took the bag of plugged material to Paul Lammers.

We now understand, since the line shows no loss of volume but it did prior to the faucet being dug up, that when we replaced the faucet and cleaned up the plugged line we must have, when we put the 2" Poly back on the new faucet, took care of the leak in the line.

After evaluating the data you sent to us, as well as our own testing, coupled with the information provided by yourself when you and Lammers ran flow tests. We conclude:

1.) There was definitely a loss of pressure and volume flow prior to the excavation of the faucet.

2.) The lack of flow to the faucet and the shop was greatly improved when the lines were flushed and the black poly fiber was removed.

3.) The drop in the pressure at the pump could have been corrected when we replaced the faucet and reconnected the 2"black Poly pipe to the faucet.

4.) The good news is that the pressure at the pump is constant and the pump is not re- cycling without a reason.

We now feel that this issue has been resolved and we can cross it off the list of Response Actions listed on Oct. 12, 2005 from the items identified at the meeting with Max Dodson.

Sincerely,

Mel & Lerah Parker